

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DONNA HINES,

No. C-07-4145 CW (EMC)

Plaintiff,

v.

**ORDER RE DISCOVERY DISPUTE RE
PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSES TO
INTERROGATORIES**

CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES
COMMISSION, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Currently pending before the Court is a discovery dispute in which Defendant the CPUC asks the Court to compel Plaintiff Donna Hines to respond to interrogatories to which the Court has already ordered her to respond. Having considered the parties' submissions, the Court hereby **GRANTS** the motion to compel.

Previously, the Court issued an order requiring Ms. Hines to respond to interrogatories in which the CPUC asked her to state the facts supporting her contention that (1) she suffered discriminatory and retaliatory treatment; (2) the CPUC's Human Resources Department can and has altered examination results to favor management's preferred candidates; and (3) she suffered emotional distress as a result of the CPUC's actions. *See* Docket No. 298 (order, filed on 3/19/2010). In her responses, Ms. Hines did not provide any narrative but instead simply referred to unspecified facts contained in a broad swathe of documents. This is patently insufficient. While Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 33(d) allows a party to refer to documents in responding to an interrogatory, that is only where "the burden of deriving or ascertaining the answer will be substantially the same for either party." Fed. R. Civ. P. 33(d). Ms. Hines has made no

1 demonstration that that is the case here. Moreover, Rule 33(d) only allows for such an approach
2 where the relevant documents are specified “in sufficient detail to enable the interrogating party to
3 locate and identify them as readily as the responding party could.” *Id.* Ms. Hines’s broad reference
4 to pleadings, attachments, appendices, and requests for judicial notice is insufficient.

5 Accordingly, the Court orders Ms. Hines to provide a complete and full response to the
6 interrogatories at issue within a week of the date of this order.

7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 Dated: May 3, 2010

9
10 
11 EDWARD M. CHEN
12 United States Magistrate Judge
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DONNA HINES,

No. C-07-4145 CW (EMC)

Plaintiff,

v.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES
COMMISSION, *et al.*,

Defendants.

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the U.S. District Court, Northern District of California. On the below date, I served a true and correct copy of the attached, by placing said copy/copies in a postage-paid envelope addressed to the person(s) listed below, by depositing said envelope in the U.S. Mail; or by placing said copy/copies into an inter-office delivery receptacle located in the Office of the Clerk.

Donna Hines
268 Bush Street, #3204
San Francisco, CA 94104
415-205-3377

Dated: May 3, 2010

RICHARD W. WIEKING, CLERK

By:



Betty Lee
Deputy Clerk